

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
S/N 10/055,634
Page 8 of 13

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 30, 2003. In view of the amendments and the following discussion, the Applicants believe that all claims are in allowable form.

The Applicants have elected to expedite prosecution of this patent application by amending the claims into allowable form as suggested by the Examiner. The Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the original subject matter in divisional and/or continuation applications.

Double Patenting

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-3 and 20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of United States patent 6,494,955, issued December 17, 2002. The Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's request for a terminal disclaimer for provisional obvious-type double patenting rejection. A terminal disclaimer shall be filed in response to an indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

A. 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Claims 1, 3 and 10-11

Claims 1, 3 and 10-11 stand rejected as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,904,872 issued May 18, 1999 to *Arami et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "*Arami*"). In response, the Applicants have cancelled claims 1 and 3, and rewritten claim 8 in independent form. Claim 8, as rewritten, has been indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Claims 10-11 have amended to depend from claim 8.

Thus, the Applicants submit that independent claim 8 and claims 10-11 depending therefrom are patentable over *Arami*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

B. 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Claims 25-26, 29 and 35

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
S/N 10/055,634
Page 9 of 13

Claims 25-26, 29 and 35 stand rejected as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,688,331 issued May 18, 1999 to *Aruga et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "*Aruga*"). In response, the Applicants have amended claim 25 to more clearly recite aspects of the invention. Claim 29 has been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim 25 recites limitations not taught or suggested by *Aruga*. *Aruga* teaches a substrate support having a stem coupled to a substrate support. The substrate support is comprised of various layers. The lowest layer of the substrate support is coupled to the stem.

Claim 25 recites a stem coupled to a first side of a ceramic body. A plate circumscribes the stem and is disposed adjacent to the first side of the ceramic body. A retaining means is provided for releasably retaining the plate to the ceramic body. A channel is defined between the first side of the ceramic body and a first side of the plate. *Aruga* does not teach or suggest a stem coupled to a first side of a ceramic body, a plate circumscribing the stem and disposed adjacent the first side of a ceramic body, and a means for releasably retaining the plate to the ceramic body.

Thus, the Applicants submit that claim 25, and claims 26, 29 and 35 depending therefrom are patentable over *Aruga*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

C. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claim 2, 4 and 5

Claims 2, 4 and 5 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Arami* in further view of United States Patent No. 6,113,702 issued May 18, 1999 to *Halpin et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "*Halpin*"). In response, the Applicants have cancelled these claims without prejudice, and represented the limitations of claims 2, 4, and 5 in new claims 37-39, which depend from claim 8 as discussed below.

D. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claim 24

Claim 24 stands rejected as being unpatentable over *Aran* in view of *Aruga*, and in further view of *Halpin*. Although the Applicants have rewritten claim 24 in independent form, the Applicants disagree with the Examiner's assertion that claim 24 is unpatentable over the cited references.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
S/N 10/055,634
Page 10 of 13

Arami teaches a heater, but does not teach how lift pins extend through the heater or that the heater is coupled to a stem. *Aruga* is discussed above. The Examiner asserts that *Halpin* teaches a modification of a combined *Arami/Aruga* substrate support which would yield the invention of claim 24. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Halpin teaches a substrate support having a top plate and a bottom plate. A lift pin is disposed through the top plate. The bottom of the lift pin includes a tab that sits on the bottom plate. The tab is larger than the hole in the top plate so that the tab is captured between the top plate and a bottom plate, fixing the pin relative to the substrate support.

Claim 24 recites at least one lift pin guide disposed through a ceramic body and a plate, the lift pin guide having a tab extending radially therefrom, such that the plate is retained by the tab to the body. The captured pin of *Halpin* does not retain the plate to the body.

Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion to modify the structure of *Arami/Aruga* with the lift pin of *Halpin* in a manner that would yield the subject matter of claim 24. Thus, the Applicants submit that claim 24, and all claims depending therefrom, are patentable over *Arami* in view of *Aruga*, and in further view of *Halpin*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

E. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claim 27-28

Claims 27-28 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Aruga* in view of *Halpin*. In response, the Applicants have rewritten claim 24, from which claims 27-28 depend, to more clearly recite aspects of the invention.

As discussed above in section D, there is no teaching or suggestion to modify the structure of *Aruga* with the lift pin of *Halpin* in a manner that would yield the subject matter of claim 24. Thus, the Applicants submit that claim 24, and claims 27-28 depending therefrom, are patentable over *Aruga* in further view of *Halpin*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
S/N 10/055,634
Page 11 of 13

F. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claim 13 and 20

Claims 13 and 20 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Arami* in view of *Aruga*, and in further view of United States Patent No. 5,695,568 issued December 9, 1997 to *Sinhra et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "*Sinhra*"). In response, the Applicants has rewritten claim 8 in independent form and amended claims 13 and 20 to depend therefrom.

Claim 8, as rewritten, has been indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Thus, the Applicants submit that independent claim 8, and claims 13 and 20 depending therefrom, are patentable over *Arami*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

G. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claim 15-19

Claims 15-19 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Arami* in view of United States Patent No. 6,113,704, issued September 5, 2000, to *Satoh et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "*Satoh*"). In response, the Applicants have rewritten claim 8 in independent form and amended claims 15-19 to depend therefrom.

Claim 8, as rewritten, has been indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Thus, the Applicants submit that independent claim 8, and claims 15-19 depending therefrom, are patentable over *Arami*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

H. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claims 30-34

Claims 30-34 stand rejected as being unpatentable over *Aruga* in view *Satoh*. Although the Applicants have amended claims 30-34 to depend from claim 24, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that that the substrate support of *Aruga* may be modified with the releasable top plate taught by *Satoh* to yield the invention of claim 24.

Aruga is discussed above. *Satoh* teaches a heater having a detachable top plate. The top plate is removable to allow easy removal from a heating block that is mounted to the chamber by a stem.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
S/N 10/055,634
Page 12 of 13

Claim 24 recites a lower plate that is disposed around the stem and is releasable from a bottom plate that is coupled to the stem. Neither *Satoh* or *Aruga* teach a lower plate that is disposed around the stem and is releasable from a bottom plate that is coupled to the stem. As the top plate of claim 24 remains coupled to the stem while the lower plate is released therefrom, the combination of *Satoh* or *Aruga* cannot teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 24.

Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion to modify the structure of *Aruga* with the releaseable top plate of *Satoh* in a manner that would yield the subject matter of claim 24. Thus, the Applicants submit that claim 24, and all claims depending therefrom, are patentable over *Aruga* in view of *Satoh*. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 37-42 have been added. The Applicants believe that claims 37-42 are fully supported by the specification and do not introduce new matter. As claims 37-42 depend from claims 8 and 24 which are allowable for the reasons discuss above, claim 37-42 recite limitations patentable over the art of record. Thus, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

ALLOWED CLAIMS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his comments regarding the allowability of claim 8. In response, claim 8 has been rewritten as suggested by the Examiner, and claims 9-21 have been amended to depend therefrom. Accordingly, the Applicants request allowance of these claims.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issuance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that any unresolved issues still exist, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Keith Taboada at (732) 530-9404 so that

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
S/N 10/055,634
Page 13 of 13

appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Oct 30, 2003



Keith P. TABOADA
Reg. No. 45,150
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile under 37 C.F.R. §1.8 on October 30, 2003 and is addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, Facsimile No: (703) 872-9310.

Allyson M. DeVesty
Signature

Allyson M. DeVesty
Printed Name of Person Signing

10-30-03
Date of signature